The Modern Churchman.

No. 8. NOVEMBER, 1917. Vol. VII.

LIBRARY

IN MEMORIAM.

EARL GREY, P.C., G.C.B., G.C.M.G., G.C.V.O.

(Vice-President of the Churchmen's Union).

By the Very Rev. W. Moore Ede, D.D., Dean of Worcester.

In the passing away of Earl Grey on August 29th, our public life has lost one of its most interesting personalities; a man of extraordinarily wide and varied interests, and an incurable optimist, who by his infectious enthusiasm accomplished many social reforms.

The Right Hon. Albert Henry George Grey, Fourth Earl, came of an old liberty loving Northumbrian stock, his grandfather being author of the great Reform Bill of 1832, to whom his father had acted as private secretary, a position which he afterwards held in connection with Queen Victoria.

Earl Grey, who graduated as Senior in the Law Tripos at Cambridge, first came before the public when as Albert Grey, the rising hope of North Country Liberals, he contested Northumberland against his relative, Edward Ridley, in one of the closest election contests on record—victorious by two votes; the numbers pronounced equal on a recount, and when Parliament ordered a scrutiny, a majority of two being declared in favour of his opponent. At the next election, in 1880, there was no question as to Grey's victory. He sat in Parliament for six years, but when in 1886 he declined to follow Mr. Gladstone in his Home Rule policy he lost his seat. He never stood for Parliament again, as on the death of his uncle his entry into the serener atmosphere of the House of Lords removed him from the arena of electoral strife. His career as a statesman; his work in South Africa; the part he played in the foundation of Rhodesia, and as Governor-General of Canada; belong to the history of the Empire. It is his work

as a Christian philanthropist and a Churchman which is the special interest of the readers of the *Modern Churchman.* A man of broad national sympathies, Earl Grey ardently desired to widen the outlook of the Church of England, and to render it more truly national. He therefore became a member of the Church Reform Union, the objects of which were—

> "To make the Church National in more than name; to relax the tests imposed on candidates for Holy Orders; and to give parishioners the right of appointing their own clergy, and a voice in determining the character of the services in their parish church."

Objects which Grey in his breezy way described as "up with the Wardens and down with the Parson." In this campaign he was assisted by George Harwood, of Manchester, and, if I remember right, the Rev. Stewart Headlam, and others. But the clergy, who had no desire to lose their power as local autocrats, and be placed under the heels of the laity, proved too strong, and after a few years of fitful agitation the Church Reform Union ceased to exist. Whether the present attempt to embody part of the programme in the form of Statutory Parish Councils as is proposed in the Archbishops' Report will prove more successful, remains to be seen. If it fails, it is evident that clerical autocracy is so rapidly alienating the laity that the Church is fast losing its claim to be national, and disestablishment is inevitable.

From the reform of the Church Earl Grey turned to the reform of our industrial relations, and threw himself heartily into the co-operative movement, of which he became a steadfast advocate. He practised what he preached, and applied the principles of co-operation on his own estate, and was proud of the success of the co-operative store in his own village of Howick. Well does the writer remember a glorious summer day at Howick when representatives of all the co-operative societies of Northumberland, and many from Durham, for the most part miners and their wives, were entertained by the Earl, who addressed us in his bright, cheery way, and presented us all with a medal inscribed with the words, "From slave to serf, from serf to hireling, from hireling to partner."

An ardent believer in housing reform on co-operative lines, he was a supporter of Letchworth and the Garden suburb movements, and when he was Governor-General of Canada he invited Mr. Henry Vivian to visit the Dominion and expound to the people of that country the advantages of limited dividends and co-operative enterprise as embodied in the Tenants, Ltd., movement, if they would save their cities from the overcrowding and the other ills which soulless capitalistic competition have caused in England. When he returned from Canada he endeavoured to revive a scheme for creating a Garden City on Tyneside which would have involved an expenditure of something like £1,000,000, and would have secured healthy surroundings for a large industrial population, and done much to alleviate the congestion which the influx of workers, due to the war, has caused. Unfortunately private interests proved too strong.

One of Earl Grey's latest public acts was the opening of an extension of a Garden suburb at Worcester. This gave him an opportunity of visiting the small holdings in the Vale of Evesham, which he described as "the hope of England."

Like everyone who cares for the welfare of his fellows, he realised the importance of Temperance Reform, and with the view of combatting the evils of our licensing system, founded the Public House Trust Co., in which the managers receive a percentage on all non-alcoholic refreshments, but none on alcholic, and thus have no interest in pushing the sale of drink, and as shareholders may not receive more than 5% on their capital, there are funds available for improving the houses for the benefit of their customers.

The origin of this Trust movement is worth narrating, as it illustrates the generous character and the public spirit of the man.

A large population had sprung up at a colliery in which Earl Grey was interested. It appeared inevitable that a licence would be granted, so rather than let some outside brewery

company obtain it, Earl Grey applied himself for a licence. To the surprise of the Earl when the licence was granted, he was at once offered £10,000 for it. This caused him furiously to think why should he receive £10,000 when he had done nothing for it? He refused the offer, and declining all personal advantage, founded the Public House Trust Co., and made the licence over to it.

A close friend of Cecil Rhodes, he was a great believer in closer union between the English speaking peoples, and used every opportunity afforded him as Governor-General of Canada to cultivate friendly relations with the statesmen and citizens of the United States. When, therefore, a movement was inaugurated for the celebration of the hundred years peace between Great Britain and the United States, which dated from the Rush Bagot treaty of 1816, when both nations agreed to disarmament along their frontier, and the 100 years peace which followed, triumphantly vindicated the practical wisdom of acting on Christian principles, it was natural that Earl Grey should be chosen Chairman of the British Committee, and natural that he should throw himself heartily into various schemes for celebrating this Centenary. Unfortunately the outbreak of the War necessitated the postponement of the Celebration which, now that the United States has joined the Allies, will probably assume larger dimensions when peace renders it possible to hold it.

It is difficult for one who knows Northumberland to recount Earl Grey's philanthropic activities and tell how he was one of the founders of the University Extension movement in the North, an active member of the County Council, a promoter of the chair of Agriculture at the Armstrong College, and keenly interested in the Experimental Farm. Until Earl Grey went to South Africa there was scarcely any movement in the North for the uplifting of humanity with which he was not in some way connected, and to which he did not impart some of his spirit of breezy optimism. Behind all this life of

philanthropic activity there lay religious conviction. English-like, he did not talk about it, but those who knew him best felt that the background was a broad catholic Christianity, and none were surprised when he arranged a service in Church as part of the programme of the Co-operative Conference at Howick. To him, as to so many whose hope of social improvement had been high, the War came as a terrible blow, for it meant the inevitable postponement of his hopes and the frustration of so much of his work for humanity.

We shall not see his face, nor listen to his cheery voice again in this life, but the best wish we can offer for the generation on whom will rest the rebuilding of England after the War, is that God may raise up as leaders among them, single-minded men animated by that Christian public spirit which marked the strenuous life of Earl Grey.

SIGNS OF THE TIMES.

Two Needful Steps towards Re-union.

There are many indications of the drawing together both in England and at the Front of the clergy of the different Christian communions. Re-union is seen to be more and more desirable and needful, and yet neither side can secure it on its own terms. It is clear that as a preliminary to re-union a great concession must be made by both Anglicans and Free Churchmen. A concession which in each case goes against the traditions and feelings of the body that makes it—a veritable sacrifice.

It is often urged that Free Churchmen are opposed to episcopacy. If by the term episcopacy, is meant a primitive and constitutional episcopacy, we believe that view to be incorrect. On the contrary there is a growing tendency towards episcopacy in the government of the Free Churches. What the Free Churches fear is the making of any concession to Anglicans which might be regarded as a denial of the validity of their own ministries. Therefore before re-union is possible, Anglicans

must whole-heartedly affirm the validity and equality of Free Church ministries with their own. They must publicly adopt as the test of a valid ministry, the test of fruits not roots. We recognise how hard a concession this is for many Anglicans to make, but it must be done in the interests of re-union. This does not mean the sacrifice by them of their own historic orders: in the Church of the future both types of ministry will co-exist.

On the other hand Free Churchmen must concede that the true and right ideal of the Church is that spiritual unity should be demonstrated by corporate unity. Free Churchmen seem to teach that spiritual unity can be a substitute for corporate unity. The corporate unity of the disciples is required in St. John's Gospel as a testimony to the world of the Divine Mission of the Saviour, and we are all conscious to-day that the divisions among Christians have not only rendered the Churches hopelessly feeble in the presence of international bloodshed, but have also helped to waste their resources and energy and influence in the presence of national vice and paganism. The Anglican earnestly desires corporate unity, and he believes this to be the will of Christ. On the other hand it seems to him that what the Free Churchman really desires is not corporate unity but ecclesiastical recognition, and the stiff traditional Anglican feels in the presence of that demand somewhat as Polycarp felt when Marcion came up to him in the streets of Rome and said, "Recognise us, Polycarp," and the saintly bishop of Smyrna replied: "I recognise you as the first-born of Satan."

What then is needful is that the Free Churchman should concede that corporate unity is in accordance with the mind of Christ, and that for more than one Christian corporation or communion to exist in one locality is schismatical, and that schism is a sin. It may be the Anglican's sin or it may be the Free Churchman's sin; or more probably it is the sin of both. It is hard for the Free Churchman to concede this, but it is as needful to re-union that he should do it as that the Anglican should concede the validity and equality of Nonconformist

ministries. Yet in making this concession it will not follow hat the Free Churchman's particular organization or corporaion, any more than the historic episcopate of the Anglican, will e sacrificed; it will be co-ordinated. With these two great reliminary concessions made, co-operation and intercommuion between Anglicans and Free Churchmen might follow mmediately. At a later stage, after other things are set in rder, actual corporate re-union might be accomplished.

The Bishops and the Education Bill.

In the past, Churchmen have done much for the cause of ational education, and the bishops were true to their best raditions when they recently united in support of Mr. Fisher's Education Bill. To do this requires on their part a breadth of outlook and a degree of moral courage which is not lightly to be stimated.

The Bill, while full of excellent proposals, has at least two rave defects from the ecclesiastical point of view. First, seems to ignore the vexed question of religious instruction. hat question is one about which all "good Churchmen" are xtremely sensitive. For the bishops to support a measure hich does not guarantee definite Church teaching in the schools hews a fine faith in the patriotism and insight of one who an hardly be credited with strong ecclesiastical sympathies. It eans, we dare to believe, that our Church's leaders will be ound willing in the near future to support any sound system of eligious and moral teaching in the schools, even though it be n modern and national rather than as heretofore on strictly aditional and denominational lines.

The second great objection to the Education Bill is that ome of its clauses seem to vest an absolute authority in the ands of the Board of Education. Whilst Mr. Fisher is resident of the Board there is no doubt nothing to fear, but ound lawyers believe in eliminating the personal factor in idging of the probable effect of Parliamentary measures.

That the Bishops, whose Church schools have been subjected of late years to the bitter process known as "bloodless administration," have been ready to forget and forgive, and are willing to urge the second reading of a Bill which contains such sinister clauses, is full of promise for the future. It suggests that we are going to exchange as the motto of our Church's policy, "The Church for the Church's sake," for the better motto, "The Church for the Nation's sake." A Church that does that consistently will not only deserve to be national, but will become so.

The Church Franchise.

It was foreseen by far-sighted Churchmen some years ago that the crucial difficulty in granting any measure of self-government to the laity would be connected with the qualification for the Church suffrage. The discussion of the Archbishops' Report on Church and State has shewn the cleavage which exists on this question. One party (for the most part Anglo-Catholic) desires the Confirmation or Communicant qualification, the other party (for the most part Liberal and Evangelical) desires the Baptismal qualification united to the declaration of Church of England membership.

In the recent correspondence in the *Times* dealing with this question, the Bishop of Oxford appeared as the protagonist for the Confirmation or Communicant qualification, and declared the alternative to be "a wholly unreasonable proposal." Powerful letters from the Bishops of Carlisle, Manchester, and Norwich and Dean Wace, stated the case for the wider franchise, and we venture to think in such a form as to appeal to the vast majority of the English laity if they are not too much occupied to heed it. We need not attempt to reproduce their arguments here. Suffice it to say that the wider suffrage in various forms exists with rare exceptions in all the great and growing Anglican communions abroad, and that the narrower suffrage which is advocated by the Archbishops' Report is alien to the spirit and policy of the English Church, shuts the doors of the future

against a wider and more comprehensive Churchmanship than is dominant in clerical circles at present, and would so narrow practical Church membership as to lead almost immediately to the Disestablishment and Disendowment of the Church of England. That Disestablisment is desired by the more ardent advocates of the narrower franchise is no secret, but those who do not desire Disestablishment and Disendowment will be well advised to support the widest franchise possible. At any rate the more men and women who can be led either by the franchise or by any other means to take an interest in Church life, the better for them and for the Nation and Church.

This does not mean that we think lightly of Holy Communion, but hold that it should be regarded as the ecclesiastical *terminus ad quem* and not the ecclesiastical *terminus a quo.* There was a time when Christians like Constantine the Great preferred to postpone Baptism to their death-bed; there is the opposite tendency to day: some wish to administer the Holy Communion to infants. It might be better for Churchpeople to be confirmed only after they have begun to take an active interest in Church life and its responsibilities rather than as a preliminary to doing so. In any case, both parties are agreed that Church offices had better be limited to communicants.

There is one negative qualification proposed for the Franchise which we should wish to see abandoned. It is the declaration that the would-be voter does "not belong to any religious body which is not in communion with the Church of England." Why should he be required before voting to foreswear allegiance to any other Christian Communion? We may suppose that he attends the Church Services, and that he subscribes to her funds, but he is at the same time a Methodist or a Presbyterian. Why should he be required to surrender his Methodist or Presbyterian membership before attending and voting at a parish meeting? The writer knew an admirable Anglican clergyman who fell recently as a combatant in France. He had been brought up a Methodist, and continued to attend Methodist class-meetings

after his ordination. Why should he be forbidden to do so? There are a number of Presbyterians resident in England, who are not willing to give up their membership in the Kirk of Scotland, but who would wish to take an active part in English Church life. Why require them first, when we consider the interests of the larger Christianity of the future, to sever their connection with the communions of their birth? We hope that Liberal Churchmen will hesitate to bar inter-denominationalism in the interests of what may prove to be sectarianism.

We are glad to see that the Life and Liberty Movement after prolonged consideration has decided to stand for the wider suffrage. We hope that it will decline after further consideration to support the negative affirmation as a necessary condition of enfranchisement. "He that is not against us is for us."

A Fight in the Dark.

The proposal with the consent of the Bishop of London to celebrate the Holy Communion on November 6th at All Saints', Margaret Street, according to the form prescribed in the first reformed English Prayer Book of 1549, commonly known as the First Prayer Book of Edward VI. has caused considerable, and we cannot but feel, quite unnecessary outcry and opposition. Students are aware that the Office of Holy Communion in the First Prayer Book of Edward VI. approximates more closely to the Roman Mass than the service prescribed in our present Prayer Book, but that is not necessarily an objection to it. We certainly object to the Roman doctrine of Transubstantiation, but it is of importance to realise that the Roman Canon of the Mass, *i.e.*, the central and essential portion of the Service, was composed some centuries before the doctrine of Transubstantiation was formulated, and is not taught in it. In some respects the Roman Church is the most conservative Church in Christendom. In St. Peter's the Pope still celebrates in the position in which all the bishops of the primitive Church of the first four centuries celebrated the Holy Communion, *i.e.*,

standing on the west side of the altar facing the congregation. There is also little doubt that the Roman Canon of the Mass owes its composition to that golden age of the Church to which St. Ambrose, St. Augustine, and St. Jerome belonged. It is probably contemporary with the *Te Deum* and many of our most beautiful Prayer Book collects. Moreover large portions of the Canon of the Mass, but broken up and re-arranged, form part of our present Communion Service. Many educated High Churchmen who wish as far as possible to preserve the historical continuity of the English Church, and to feel in their worship that they are taking part (but in their own tongue) in the actual service in which the great Christian Church of the West has continuously celebrated the Holy Communion, have a particular affection for the form of the First Prayer Book of Edward VI. Evangelical Churchmen, however, prefer our present Liturgy, and certainly there are features in the Liturgy of the Prayer Book of 1549 which both Liberals and Evangelicals would would oppose strongly if an attempt were made to substitute this Liturgy for our present one. But it ought to be remembered that the Episcopal Church of Scotland, and also the Episcopal Church of America—Churches in communion with our own—have a communion office closely akin to that of the First Prayer Book of Edward VI. Many Churchpeople are not aware of these facts, and an appeal to Protestant rancour sometimes prevails because of the ignorance of those to whom it is made.

We have urged strongly, and on various occasions, that at least three services of Holy Communion should be sanctioned for use in the Church of England: (1) The present Service, (2) the Liturgy of the First Prayer Book of Edward VI., (3) A modern Liturgy which has yet to be published. This last, although the latest to be composed, would present the most primitive ideal of the Sacrament, and one which we believe would make the profoundest appeal to the modern mind. Its central thought would be the coming of the Kingdom of God; it

would be the corporate act of worship of the sons of the Kingdom; the occasion of the renewal of the spiritual covenant revealed by Jesus Christ, and of the resolution to follow Him faithfully who ratified that covenant with His blood.

These three types of service should meet the needs of all reasonable Anglicans. We would appeal to Anglo-Catholics and Evangelicals to support this proposal. Uniformity is dead. It has failed to secure unity. Unity is secured by the spirit of love and loyalty, and should permit of wide diversity of methods where the spirit of love and loyalty is present. The policy of inventing and enforcing compromises which really suit no one absolutely, may be sound enough in economics and politics, but fails in the sphere of religion and ethics.

Wake up, Laymen!

Many English laymen complain of clericalism in the English Church. They complain that the Church ignores their wishes and gives them no power to reform abuses. That the whole Church is run from the point of view of the parson, and run very unsatisfactorily at that. Without admitting these charges to the full, we would venture to point out that nobody in Church or State, or anywhere else, retains their rights without considerable watchfulness, nor do they regain their lost rights without much effort and organisation. Great changes are pending in the Church, and it is essential at this critical time that the lay voice should make itself heard in the Church's Councils. With this object in view, a lay-section of the Churchmen's Union has been formed, and it is to be hoped that it will receive general support. Lay Liberal ideals and methods probably differ from clerical Liberal ideals and methods, and it is certain that much in the way of moral support, may be gained, especially in difficult matters, by having the lay judgment formed and formulated apart from the clerical.

Liberal laymen complain at times of the lack of courage and out-spokenness on the part of the Liberal clergy. We do not

desire to defend the Liberal clergy from this charge. Their pastoral position in many cases renders their duty of absolute truthfulness difficult. To speak the truth in love is no easy matter, and to sin, either against truth or against charity, is what too often befalls. Laymen are freer than the clergy, and they are often in a position to take a more open-minded, though it must also be confessed, at times, a more superficial view than the clergy. At any rate, lay views, if carefully expressed after study and consultation, would carry very great weight in matters of Church policy. Too often those views are never uttered. The clergy have no idea in many a Church crisis what the thoughtful laity think or need. The obvious answer is that it is not worth while for the ordinary layman to express his views as he really has no legal power. He is silent because speech is useless; he is inactive because he is powerless. Moreover, talking is the function of the clergy.

The Liberal view of the Church, and it was the primitive view, is that it is a corporation of which both laymen and clergymen are priests—the clergy are the priests selected by their fellow-priests as representatives of the whole body, to perform priestly functions in the congregation—but that ought not to mean that the priests who are not representatives for this purpose, cease to exercise any of their powers of priesthood. Better abolish representative priests altogether than that the priesthood of the whole body of believers should be forgotten or ignored. The Churchmen's Union claims, as one of its aims, "to assert the rights and duties of the laity as constituent members of the body of Christ." We venture to hope that the Lay Section, in regard to which we publish in this number an exposition by the author of *Pro Christo et Ecclesia*, will help our Church at this critical period of her history to take the right turning in a number of difficult situations which lie ahead. But to do that, organisation and energy are needed, else, as the judicious Hooker warns us, we may "basely through silence allow things to pass away as in a dream."

THE REFORM MACHINE.

By the Editor.

The Archbishops' Report on Church and State is now being discussed in the Ruri-decanal Chapters and Diocesan Conferences throughout the length and breadth of the land. It is not hard to gauge clerical feeling with regard to it. The great bulk of the clergy are inclined to support it as a step in the right direction. Some extreme Anglo-Catholics would prefer Disestablishment, which would confer upon the Church complete ecclesiastical autonomy which they dignify by the name of spiritual freedom, but even these extremists are inclined to support the Scheme temporarily, feeling sure that it must inevitably lead to Disestablishment, and should a conflict occur meanwhile between Church and State, they could at once abandon the proposed compromise and support Disestablishment.

Liberal Churchmen also feel but little enthusiasm for the Scheme proposed by the Report. What Liberal Churchmen earnestly desire are those deep and difficult reforms which are not secured by the alteration of the relation of the Church to Parliament, but are the outcome of a changed heart and mind in clerical circles. Some of the reforms they advocate, such as the better training of ordinands, require no appeal at all to Parliament; other reforms such as the modernisation of our Church formularies and services, the interchange of pulpits with Nonconformists, the establishment of parochial councils legally endowed with a large measure of control in parochial matters, the compulsory combination and re-division of rural parishes, would require an appeal to Parliament, yet if the Church as a whole could agree upon simple, practical measures to secure these reforms, we do not believe that in normal times at any rate Parliament would hesitate to pass them. Church bills have not passed because in too many cases they seemed

to Parliament to be tinkering measures, or else had only a divided support in Church circles. While therefore Liberal Churchmen will not admit the plea that in the past Parliament is to blame for not having legalised desirable and urgent measures of Church Reform, they recognise that in the present condition of the Church some scheme by which the Church shall be encouraged to initiate legislation on its own behalf deserves support. The persistent discussion of reforms by Church assemblies must in time prepare such an unanimity of Church opinion as shall secure their practical realisation.

The Scheme for the constitution of a Church Council as proposed by the Archbishops' Report does, however, promise possibilities. The misfortune is that these possibilities are remote. What we shall get under the Scheme is not the urgent and vital reforms we desire, but a Reform Machine which we are led to believe will in time give us every reform which is good for us. Moreover, we are assured that if we do not accept the Reform Machine we shall get no reforms at all. Our authorities are only going to give us reforms manufactured by the Reform Machine. Liberal Churchmen still plead that they would prefer the Reforms, and would gladly dispense with the Reform Machine. They are told this is impossible. They must either accept with unanimity the Reform Machine, or they must suffer Disestablishment and Disendowment. Their situation is like that of a razorless man entering the only accessible barber's shop, and asking to be shaved. The barber replies: "Sorry, Sir, but the police regulations forbid it. I have here, however, a shaving machine —a new invention highly commended by its makers. It only costs a sovereign, and in a short time if you practise hard you will be able to shave yourself with it. If it does not turn out to be first-class at shaving, at least it will make a very nice beard trimmer, and in the last resort may be used for decapitation." The customer buys the shaving machine. It is a choice of evils, and he chooses the one which seems to promise,

although somewhat vaguely, to do for him in the future what he desires to be done at once.

Liberal Churchmen then will do well to accept the Reform Machine offered to them. It possesses great possibilities for good or evil. Which of the two sets of possibilities will be realised must depend upon the spirit of the Church, and particularly the spirit of the bishops and clergy. We cannot but remember that the Church of England has never yet been able to reform herself from within. Her two great reformers, Henry VIII. and Lord Brougham, only carried their reforms in the teeth of strong ecclesiastical opposition.

But the War is undoubtedly educating us all, and without being unduly optimistic, we may reasonably hope that much which has in the past hindered Church Reform in the Convocations and clerical circles will be eliminated from the Church Council and other representative Church bodies which it is proposed to constitute under the Scheme.

While, however, accepting and supporting the Scheme as a whole, there are, we believe, various proposals in it which the great bulk of Liberal Churchmen desire to see modified.

(1) They desire to see the Church Suffrage given to all adults (male and female) who have been baptized and declare themselves to be members of the Church of England.

(2) They desire the removal of the limitation to the House of Bishops of the sole right to initiate measures for liturgical and doctrinal reform. They regard it as most important that the clergy and laity should also have the right to initiate such measures.

(4) They desire that the Enabling Act should include the constitution of Parochial Councils, and that its provisions shall on no account be altered in the future except by Act of Parliament.

(5) They desire that no Church Canon shall receive the Royal Assent which shall not first have lain on the tables of both Houses of Parliament, and also thereafter have been

passed in the manner proposed by the Report, *i.e.*, after a single reading in each House.

(6) They desire that laywomen should have the same right as laymen to election to the Church's representative assemblies.

(7) They desire the adoption of some method of election to the Church representative bodies, by which, at every stage, the representation of minorities shall be secured.

(8) They desire to see deans sit as *ex officio* members of the House of Clergy, but would prefer that archdeacons who are *oculi episcoporum* should not sit in the House of Clergy except when elected by the clergy of their respective Archdeaconries.

There are matters in connection with the Report about which Liberal Churchmen desire more information, *e.g.*, What is to be the actual Parliamentary procedure by which a measure is to be passed once through both the Houses? How is the proposed Ecclesiastical Committee of the Privy Council to be constituted? Will laymen only sit on it? Must these all be Churchmen? Will it be within the power of the Church Council to legislate on every matter touching Church interests, *e.g.*, the abolition of the right of appeal to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council in ecclesiastical causes? On these and other points in the Scheme we should like more light. We know, with Stevenson's Spae-wife, that "its gey and easy speerin," but we do not desire to be presented with "a pig in a poke."

The great majority of the laity know nothing of the Scheme, and it would give them little joy to discover that through inertia they have blindly assented to a Scheme which, instead of transferring the power of Parliament to the laity, has merely transferred it to the bishops. Ecclesiastical autonomy must not come to mean the autocracy of the Episcopate. Bishops are presidents, they are not despots; and the Church of England will have to take care that it does not find itself hereafter in the power of a House of Prelates instead of under

the leadership of a primitive and constitutional episcopacy. If Parliament is to forego many of its rights; if the parochial incumbent is to surrender his freehold; it must only be to transfer those rights to the Church's representative assemblies and not to a small body of men whose great powers may tempt them to become a Venetian oligarchy.

The vast majority of the laity, who have neither energy, interest, nor aptitude for Church politics, would certainly declare, if consulted about the Scheme, that any scheme which would deliver them from incompetent and uncongenial incumbents and give the parochial laity a large measure of control over parochial services and organisations, would deserve and receive their support. Unfortunately the Scheme of the Report only seems to promise these things indirectly, and not to secure them at once.

THE GAP IN THE CLERICAL CREED.

By the Rev. E. W. Winstanley, D.D.

There is a very grave omission from the creed of the Christian. It is becoming increasingly obvious, especially during this world war with its pitiless exposure of defects of all sorts. It does not indeed consist in leaving any time-honoured words unsaid, but lies in the inadequate content given to certain words therein. Clergy and laity alike say or sing the phrase "I believe in the Holy Ghost," but how comparatively poor and meagre, how partial and attenuated, is the faith which those inspiring and life-transforming words express to most people.

Two or three examples or aspects of this grievous yet scarcely recognised omission from the content of practical belief may be adduced. First and most serious of all, the clergy generally teach and speak as if they cherished no belief in the Holy

Spirit as a present Power, not only guiding the Catholic Society and helping and sustaining the individual life, but also working and manifested through contemporary movements of intellectual thought, and of social and industrial experience, through the discoveries of men of science, the devoted studies of thinkers, the ideals of labour leaders, the experiments of welfare workers, although many of the agents in these phases of human progress may not be professing Christians at all. In a word, it is the predominantly *backward look* which is in our time virtually a denial of the Holy Spirit. Let it be granted at once that exceptions are met with, but in the main the clergy, who ought (as they once did, when education was almost confined to them) to lead and guide the thought of the nation, follow but falteringly and for the most part unwillingly when public opinion compels them (witness the so-called conflict between religion and science in the last century, and between historical criticism and tradition at present), and when the tide of its progress has left their antiquated and obsolete standpoint high and dry. Nevertheless, the appeal to antiquity rightly used affords a valuable restraint to errant thought and wayward practice; but to make the first century of our era, or the fifth, eleventh, or sixteenth, as the case may be, the standard of doctrinal appeal or the norm of ceremonial correctness, as happens still in conferences and meetings as well as in the expression of personal judgments, is right contrary to sense and reason and sound belief. For our century is vastly different in breadth of outlook, length of vision, and range of knowledge both of the universe and of man, from any of these periods for instance that have been named, with their restricted and mistaken views in these matters. But the same, be it emphasised, will be true some generations hence, when their thoughts and interpretations come to be compared with those of our own age.

We quote, and yet in practice we forget, the experience of the primitive Christians, who found the Lord's word true that the Holy Spirit should "guide" them and those who followed

them "into all the truth." For the process is not completed yet, it has perhaps only just begun. The promise is not withdrawn, but it may be that we are failing to make it effective for ourselves.

The activity of the Spirit is exactly the same to-day as it was in the period of the Church's infancy. His power does not alter, but we feverishly crave His outpouring, oblivious of the fact that it is rather our self-opening to the Divine inflow that is required. We take little or no notice of His ways and His thoughts as they are discernible in contemporary events, movements, and knowledge, because they do not happen at present to be ours, and so with a quite unconscious irreverence, despite the prophet's warning, we feel sure that they are not His. We are untrue to the teaching as well as to the example of the Christ in thus turning back to the dim past for standards and support, instead of opening our ears to the lessons of the present (and who can but hear them?) and looking beyond the cruel if cleansing fires of war to the horizon of the future with fulness of hope. Meanwhile, decisions of "our Mother, the Church," on the most trifling of matters, perhaps, in times of comparative ignorance are, it may be in the serenely sure "instruction" of a well-primed deacon, being hung like millstones round the necks of amenable and docile "faithful" to the resentment of educated hearers, and then we are simple enough to express pained surprise that well-informed modern men are alienated from the Church. Christ on the contrary says in substance: Look ahead. Lift up your eyes to the future. Change of mind is but the beginning. Seek not Moses or the fathers; but seek the Kingdom, and the Spirit will lead you aright. Such was the life's aim set before His adherents.

The foregoing appears to be the first great error of which the clergy must rid themselves, publicly as well as privately. We must not look to the past alone for standards of doctrine and organisation, of thought and rite. Positively put, the need is

to seek for and expect the Spirit's guidance, control and support now and in the days to come, and to set our faces courageously towards the future. Then the belief in the Holy Ghost will have more practical significance in the religious life and conduct of our people.

From this fundamental fault, this serious omission, however unconscious, of an integral part of the scriptural faith in the Holy Spirit arise other factors of the deficiency of the clergy in power of leadership and guidance. For example: want of confidence in the Spirit, which is really what an incomplete apprehension of that article in the creed comes to mean, is manifested in the *fearfulness of novelty* characteristic of Churchmen, and notably so of the clergy. It would probably be conceded that a majority of the latter seem to the plain man to be reactionary, conservative, traditionalist, obscurantist, and the judgment would not be limited to one type alone. Now it may well be admitted that with a great deposit committed to them, and a proud heritage of the ages, a jealous and cautious guardianship of their trust is praiseworthy. But here again it is to be remembered that "orthodoxy" is always the "doxy" of the past more or less remote, and our narrowly "catholic" brethren are probably the most patently forgetful of the fact that everything moves on, that the Church itself, its doctrines, and the Spirit's influence are not static but dynamic, not stationary but progressive, not monuments but growths. This timorousness in face of the urgency of change manifests itself on the one hand by a reversion to a bygone age for precedent and support, and on the other in a lack of adaptability amidst ever-changing conditions, and it is not confined merely to the fear of variation in the routine of legalised offices, and the want of elasticity in forms of worship, although these things have had a detrimental effect on the habit of church-going. Nor is it evident only in the consequent deficiency of experiment to suit local conditions and meet temporary needs, but it is apparent in relation to far deeper matters.

Re-interpretation, for instance, of ancient presentations of doctrine proceeds from generation to generation, whether councils or convocations appear to ignore the fact or not. Christian principles abide, but are continually being worked out afresh in the details characteristic of each epoch, moral, religious, or social. The fundamental doctrines remain, but the faithful of each age, collectively and individually, feel the necessity of re-expressing them in terms intelligible to themselves. And beside this, each brief period in these increasingly progressive times has its revelations and its discoveries, its new thought, its modernising, which may seem to be revolutionary or at least sets the old in a new light. So that it is unreasonable to suppose that even General Councils, for example, though comprising among their members oftentimes far from saintly men, were inspired by the Holy Ghost to arrive at decisions which should remain valid and accurate in form and expression for all time, and to set them as final and authoritative against the fresh revelations vouchsafed to us in our own day which bring new and larger understanding of the Truth: although such may not be promulgated by a Pan-Anglican or any other Conference. This progressive illumination leads to re-expressions of the doctrines of the Christian Faith which will soon in their turn become antiquated, by reason of the continuing activity of the same enlightening Spirit, according as later generations become fit for further discovery which is in all regions of knowledge but the human counterpart of divine revelation. Once more the dead hand of the past, mediated through the legalism of Church and State, has checked living development and hindered local experiment, because the ever-present potency of the Spirit (unless coming through recognised and official channels) has tended to be forgotten or ignored, and His unceasing influence in the world of men as well as in the Church or some organised portion thereof has been unacknowledged, because, in a word, Christian clergy have failed to believe fully in the Holy Ghost.

Another significant feature illustrative of an insufficient faith in the reality of the continuous power of the Spirit of God is the *want of courage* which characterises many of the clergy and laity alike. Whatever priests belonging to some Order devoted to learning or a few open-minded and independent thinkers may do in the matter of studying condemned or heretical works, the majority of the parochial clergy are little inclined to exercise their spiritual and intellectual digestion in this way. One will refuse to peruse a book because its author is "suspect," another will not consult any writing whose "soundness" or "orthodoxy" is not assured and testified beforehand, and that commonly in accordance with party standards, the straitest sect in this respect being those who claim for themselves the most comprehensive title. And if investigation tends to lead some parson who retains his studiousness to conclusions upon some point or other differing from those of an ancient council or a "safe" modern compendium of theology, he is sorely tempted to discontinue his research or timidly to compromise with truth, for fear of the horror and suspicion with which his ultra-traditionalist brethren will regard him as being not "a good Churchman." It was the possession of the Holy Spirit which enabled the Apostles to conquer the fear of man.

Nor is it very different in the case of many intelligent laymen. Historical criticism or the modern view of the universe or their own reasoned knowledge brings them to appreciate the wide divergence existing between contemporary scholarship in religious matters and the Church's formulas or decisions; and then the tendency is either to relinquish the effort to seek a a reconciliation, or else in all honesty, but for want of competent and helpful guidance—which the clergy should have been able and trusted to give—to sit loosely to religion altogether. Others, women more especially, nourished on popular religious manuals which take no notice of the progress to thought or of changed conditions, and ignore the fresh data of religious knowledge, regard anything heard or read which does not agree with their

cut-and-dried training as a trifling with doctrine. Such are likely to leave off their reading, hastily condemning as heretical the publication which has startled them, or to absent themselves from instruction rather than risk what they might deem to be a sin against the Holy Ghost; when they are themselves at the same time actually if unwittingly exhibiting a want of faith in Him and in His ultimate guidance of the consecrated thought of mankind. Contrasted with this spiritual and mental cowardice, courage to go forward, trusting to His continual illumination and support, would result in a spiritual growth and a mental progress much more truly beneficial to themselves. How much greater similarity also to the disposition of the Christ, whom they serve, does this bolder conduct manifest than that more common policy of fearfulness.

The creed is, indeed, for all members of the Christian society, but our subject has been entitled "The gap in the *clerical* creed," not because the defect under consideration is limited to the clergy, but because they are chiefly responsible for it. For a completer confidence in the work of the Spirit of God would have enabled them to approach more nearly to the ideal fulfilment of this branch of their vocation. Had they but adapted themselves to altered conditions and assimilated new knowledge as time went on, the mass of Christian people would have continued to look to them for leadership and guidance, instead of all too frequently passing them by for counsel as being ill-equipped, prejudiced, and out of sympathy with intellectual and social progress. Speaking ideally, the learned and leisured and teaching members of the priesthood would measure the import, value, and effect of each fresh revelation from any quarter touching religious life and practice; and then the secular or parochial clergy would filter the material thus afforded through their own minds, and in their turn popularise in a simplified form this ever-proceeding enlightenment from the Spirit, so that the congregations, the ordinary uninstructed lay-folk, the "children" of all ages,

should incur no violent shock at the influx of new knowledge. But they do so now, when they are left for the most part to reconcile the new with the old on their own initiative as best they may, or else to abandon the attempt; sometimes, alas, by way of reaction, attributing the sudden realisation of their ignorance to clerical deception. A firmly grasped faith in the ceaseless activity of the Holy Ghost would have prevented this failure of the priesthood to fulfil their high privilege as mediators of an ever-progressing revelation to the people whose representatives they are and whose directors they are supposed to be.

The prevalent tendency to look backward instead of forward; the common fearfulness of novelty and experiment in religious thought and practice and worship; the lack of courage and its consequent hindrance to the religious side of intellectual and social progress;—these are only some of the most easily recognisable symptoms of the widespread sin of omission with which we have been dealing. It is the negative sin of a wholly inadequate faith in the ever-present and perpetually working Spirit of God in all departments of life and knowledge; the sin of giving a pitiably impoverished content to the comprehensive article "I believe in the Holy Ghost." Yet this clause should stand as the very symbol and inspiration of so much encouragement, confidence, and hopefulness for the members, both clerical and lay, of that Catholic society which ought to constitute, not only the soul of the people, but also the redemptive factor in the world of men, wherein all life is marked by movement and development.

WESLEYAN METHODISM AND THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

By the Rev. W. F. Howard, M.A., B.D.

It is surely a sign of grace that pious platitudes about "our unhappy divisions" are now at a discount, and that on all sides there is a serious desire to end the scandal of schism. Nonconformists are accustomed to think that Anglican ecclesiasticism is the real stumbling-block, and if the *Church Times* were the authorised spokesman for the English Church any hopes of re-union would indeed be illusory. The frank treatment of the whole question, however, by the *Modern Churchman* opens a new door of hope, and the present writer gratefully accepts the opportunity of saying something in explanation of the Methodist point of view.

The recent visit of the Bishops of London and Chelmsford to the Wesleyan Methodist Conference was in no sense unique. Year by year it is the custom for the Bishop of the diocese in which the Conference is held to head a deputation of clergy, who always meet with an enthusiastic welcome, and speak words of brotherly love. But this year two factors added interest to the exchange of courtesies. The Bishop of London (following the example of the Bishop of Liverpool five years before) boldly referred to the Wesleyan Methodist *Church*. A dramatic interest was given to this speech by the well-advertised fact that his lordship had been in friendly consultation with a number of London ministers, and that some overtures were likely to follow in the direction of re-union. For reasons that can hardly be given in this place, the result was disappointing. The subject once raised is not likely to be put on one side. However grotesque may have been the exaggerations of certain half-informed newspaper gossips, there is a restless feeling in most of us that bold measures are called

for, and that only an adventurous policy is worthy of these times. It should not pass the wit of man to bridge the present gulf, for Christian statesmanship on both sides confesses dependence upon the same Spirit of truth and love.

What is the attitude of Methodism to this question? Among the ministers a growing minority are strongly attracted by the orderly forms and the devout atmosphere of Anglican worship. They are not insensible to the appeal of the immemorial past, and they believe that the liberalising movement will give flexibility to the Church, so that historic continuity and adaptation to the needs of the new world will both give her a supreme opportunity in days to come. Methodism has inherited (with slight modifications) the traditional forms for the administration of the two sacraments, and in many ways our ecclesiastical kinship is felt rather with the Mother Church than with the sister Churches of Nonconformity.

Many more are impressed by the definite doctrine of the Church of England as to the solemn significance of holy orders, and then contrast this with the slovenly way in which not a few men have gained admission to the ministry of certain of the Free Churches. In all branches of Presbyterianism and Methodism there is an impressive rite of ordination, but a fear is often expressed that Free Church union would weaken that principle in our Church polity. Many others again, who would welcome any steps towards Free Church union are wishful that in any mingling of the streams we should not merely join the other tributaries, but should be carried into such a confluence of the waters as would bring us again into the main current of the nation's religious life, and become part of the Church of the English People. Yet it may be said with confidence that very few indeed will secede from the Church of their birth under the influence of these attractions. Now and again a minister finds himself out of his true element in Methodism, and seeks, and without difficulty gains, admission to Anglican orders. A few are drawn away by the lure of

social advantage, but the majority will be loyal to the claims of their own Church. It is corporate action alone that will secure the end in view. The serious fact must be faced that most of the ministers and the great host of Methodist laymen are at present opposed to any suggestion of union with the Church of England.

Some of the reasons that govern this resolve may be suggested.

(*a*) Union with the Anglican Church, *as it is at present constituted*, would involve the ex-communication of non-episcopal Protestants throughout the world. Methodism will never consent to this. Kikuyu and its sequel are not forgotten. It burned deeply into the conscience of Methodism. At present there is nothing to prevent the freest intercommunion between these Churches. It would be ridiculous to surrender this Christian privilege for the sake of winning communion with a far smaller number of Anglicans, who, by the way, would always be welcome at the Lord's Table in our own Churches.

(*b*) The demand for re-ordination—however reasonable to the "Catholic" who clings to "Apostolic succession" as the guarantee of continuity, and who looks for union with Rome—is intolerable to the Nonconformist.

It is one thing for an individual minister to accept re-ordination when asking to be admitted to another ministry. He may reasonably argue that in making this choice he must accept the rules of the community which he joins, and can do so without prejudice to the principles of his former Church. It is quite another thing when 2000 men are asked to submit to this rite. As the Editor truly observed in the August number of this magazine—"The Wesleyans fear absorption." This would be a repudiation of our past history, a denial of the work which Providence has entrusted to Methodism. The validity of Methodist orders stands or falls by the test of the Founder of Christianity—"By their fruits ye shall know them."

(*c*) Even if these two difficulties were overcome in the favourable atmosphere of a round table conference, a more serious practical problem would remain. The numerical strength of Methodism is largely to be found in rural England. These adherents are often poorly educated, sometimes, perhaps, ignorant in their prejudices. But they are intensely loyal to the evangelical faith, and so long as the more baneful results of the Oxford Movement persist in thousands of villages nothing would induce them to throw in their lot with those whom many of them rudely regard as "papists in disguise."

(*d*) The chief opposition to any proposals for reunion with the Church of England comes from the *laymen* of Methodism. They take so active and prominent a part in administering the business and directing the policy of the Church that they are not attracted by any proposals for amalgamation with a Church in which laymen play so very subordinate a rôle.

(*e*) The difficulties so far enumerated are such as would be removed if the wise and generous policy of the *Modern Churchman* became the official attitude of the English Church. Candour, however, compels the honest observer to go further. The overwhelming feeling in Methodism, amongst both ministers and laymen, runs strongly against the present kind of relation between Church and State. It may be that logic of theory should not be stronger than the logic of facts, but it will take a great deal of argument to persuade the average Nonconformist that the right of appointing the chief officers of Christ's Church should be in the hands of a man who may be a member of the R.P.A., or a disciple of Nietzsche, not to say a Jew or an Atheist.

This may seem a very discouraging summary of the situation from the Methodist point of view. May a few words be said from the other side?

(*a*) The Methodist ministry is, as a whole, remarkably free from sectarian narrowness. There is little of the "dissidence of dissent" in its ranks. Its motto is still that of John Wesley,

"The friends of all, the enemies of none." There is certainly no bias against episcopacy. In the four theological colleges where all candidates for the ministry receive their three years' training, no time is wasted over polemical divinity. Lightfoot, Plummer, Hort, and Gwatkin are honoured names, no less than Lindsay, Ramsay, and Findlay, and men find from their books that the best Anglican scholarship is against Tractarian claims; but no attempt is made to prove that Methodism is more scriptural than any other branch of the Christian Church. Such controversial methods impress no sensible man to-day. If episcopacy can be shown to be of the *bene esse* of the Church no questions will be asked as to whether the monarchical episcopate can be discovered in the N.T. Practical expediency is seen to be the true test of providential development.

(*b*) The younger men have been greatly influenced by the Student Christian Movement, in which they have come to understand points of view quite different from their own; to discover grave defects in their own Church life and to crave for a wider Christian fellowship with both Anglicans and Free Churchmen.

(*c*) Though many of the ministers are not accomplished scholars, or even University graduates, the majority are very well grounded in biblical subjects, and are in full sympathy with the best modern criticism, while strongly evangelical in theology. It is these younger men who are more responsive to the movement for union.

(*d*) The resolute determination of the two great Scottish Churches to find a basis of agreement for a Church which shall be United, Evangelical, National, and Free, may yet lead the way to a similar discovery in England of a formula which shall unite our apparently divergent ideals of Church and State.

(*e*) But the most hopeful sign of all is the slow but sure discovery that all is not well with us. Our complacency is vanishing. Methodism is awaking to the fact that no scheme

or organised campaigns or traditional methods will avail. We have lost touch, as all other Churches have, with great masses of the people in all grades of society, because we have not put first things first. Now we are seeking earnestly for the recovery of that authentic voice of Christ and His power, both in the inward man and in the corporate life of the community, which will make all the difference between a dead and a living Church. There are now men and women in every branch of the Christian Church committed to this quest. This, surely, was the spirit which prompted the National Mission of Repentance and Hope. It is well that Bishops and Presidents and Divines from all the Churches should meet and discuss these things. It is whispered that the committees appointed to confer about Faith and Order have made great advances. But union will come ultimately from the pressure exerted by the rank and file.

I believe that if, in every Rural Deanery, the clergy made the advance and invited their Nonconformist brethren to join with them in frank discussion of the very real difficulties that divide us, a long step would have been taken towards mutual understanding and respect. As that spirit of eager enquiry spreads amongst us, surely in every parish we shall get together in circles of earnest men and women, lay and clerical alike, for study, prayer, and honest discussion, without obtruding our denominational labels, or concealing our genuine convictions. It is in this way that the fellowship in the adventure of faith will prepare the way for the fuller communion which finds formal expression in the enactments of Council, Conference, and Convocation.

THE KINGDOM OF GOD.*

By Professor Percy Gardner, Litt.D., LL.D., F.B.A., President of the Churchmen's Union.

"From that time began Jesus to preach and to say, Repent ye, for the Kingdom of heaven is at hand (or has come nigh)."—*Matt. iv.* 17.

In recent times it has been more and more clearly seen by critics that in this proclamation of the coming of a divine kingdom we may find the keynote of historic Christianity. The message was not strictly speaking new. St. Matthew attributes precisely the same words of warning to John the Baptist. And in fact they represent the consummation to which the whole of Jewish faith was tending in the age between Alexander the Great and the Christian era. The works of the Jewish Apocrypha, written at that time, are full of the hope of the dawning of a new age, when the glory of God should be shewn on earth, when sin should be put away, and the relation of men to God should pass into a new phase.

But though the idea was not new, it was taken up by Christianity into the higher region, and became the starting-point of the greatest spiritual development which the world has ever known.

Into this, as into other phrases of the earliest Christianity, we are naturally inclined to read the ideas of a later age. We think of the tree rather than of the seed. But if, as we have reason to think, the words before us are an actual utterance of our Lord at the beginning of His career, we must consider what meaning they would carry to the Galilean peasants who heard them, and for whom they were in the first instance intended. What did these carpenters and fishermen think of as the Kingdom of Heaven, or the Kingdom of God?

It would take far too long if I endeavoured to give even in outline the history of the hope of a divine Kingdom in later

*A sermon preached in St. Edward's Church (F. D. Maurice's) Cambridge, on 14th Oct., 1917

Israel. It is a matter which has occupied some of our best scholars, and on which much light has been thrown by the discovery of fresh documents. The best summary will be found in a little work by Canon Charles, called *Between the Old and New Testaments.*

But we must proceed without delay to consider the new and Christian interpretation of the idea. What Christianity touched it turned to gold. Beliefs, doctrines, hopes, it baptised into Christ, and sent them forward at a higher level. And though in many cases the actual baptism was the work of the Church, after her Master had departed, she only carried on a process which He had begun.

But what did our Lord really mean, when He began the preaching of the Kingdom? In particular was He thinking of a visible Kingdom to be shortly set up on earth, or was He thinking rather of a present spiritual Kingdom?

Not long ago a German theologian of the vigorous and rigorous type, Dr. Schweitzer, startled the Christian world by maintaining that it was only of a future visible realm that Jesus was thinking. In connection with this view he was prepared to re-read all the sayings in the Synoptic Gospels, and to maintain that the beliefs and the morality which they indicate were intended only to hold for the short interval before the consummation should take place.

I think it impossible to deny that some of our Lord's sayings do readily lend themselves to this interpretation. But there are many other sayings, equally authentic, which do not bear this rendering, such as "The Kingdom of God is within, or among you," "Seek ye first the Kingdom of God and His righteousness," "The Kingdom of God is come unto you." These phrases naturally refer to a spiritual Kingdom, already existing in the world, at least potentially, and ready to be revealed to mankind.

Schweitzer is a reasoner of the *either—or* kind. Either Jesus was thinking of a future Kingdom to be revealed by a

cataclysm, or of an existing spiritual order. This sounds like a reasonable view, but it has no real relation to the facts of life. The Jewish mind, and especially the prophetic mind, did not move in these correct lines. The future and the ideal were to the prophet inextricably mingled. The mentality of a modern critic is a thing he would not have understood.

I strongly hold that in the mind of Jesus the more inward and spiritual rendering of the idea of the divine Kingdom was primary and predominant. If He thought that it would shortly be revealed on earth, that was a secondary and less fundamental belief. Indeed, He seems to have specially disclaimed any exact knowledge of the time when the Kingdom should come.

One important branch of the subject I must leave aside. The idea of the Kingdom of God in the minds of all men includes the notion of a life beyond the grave, of future reward and punishment. And certainly it did so in the mind of Jesus Christ. The will of God is more fully done, as the Lord's Prayer teaches us, in heaven than on earth; and the divine rule, which we can but imperfectly and partially realize on earth, is fully dominant in the world of spirits. But this subject is far too great to be taken up, except as the theme of a whole discourse. Of the Kingdom in relation to the future life, then, I shall here say nothing; but speak only of the Kingdom in relation to the present life, the visible world, and the spiritual world, which can be known to men in the flesh.

It is the great happiness and merit of the Christian faith that our Lord did not leave us any cut and dried formulae, any scheme of belief. The Founder of Islam did leave his followers an authoritative code of belief and practice, and by so doing he stereotyped his religion, and it has now become a fossil, rendering almost impossible any great religious reformation, any fresh starting-point in faith. Very different is the case with Christians. Our Lord left no writing; and even the Synoptic Gospels, admirable as a record of His preaching, are

by no means infallible, but sometimes transpose that preaching in the light of the subsequent Passion, of the death on the Cross, and of the descent of the Holy Spirit upon the Apostles. Christianity was essentially a religion of movement and progress, appropriating and transforming all that was good in the religion of the world at the time, ready to make terms with all future intellectual development and ethical progress, assuming ever fresh forms.

As in the days of the Founder, so in our times, the idea of the divine Kingdom on earth may be accepted in a more materialistic or in a more spiritual way. Let us first consider one or two of the renderings which are more materialist in character.

Ecclesiastically-minded writers have given a particular turn to the discovery of the fact that the teaching of the Kingdom lies at the roots of Christianity. They have seen, with the historical critics, that the great purpose of the Founder of Christianity was to bring in a Divine Kingdom. And they add that that Kingdom did, after the Crucifixion, actually appear on earth in the form of the visible Catholic Church. This is a too narrow and superficial embodiment of the idea. That the Church arose and spread over the world is true enough. But alas! the visible Church was never a divine Kingdom. The more it grew and spread, the more it became diluted with the world, with earthly ambition and the desire of wealth and success. The Spirit of Christ has never wholly left the Church: but the Church has never been a full embodiment of the Christian Spirit. As the Jews were wrong in seeking for a visible triumph of their race, so were some leaders of the Christian Church mistaken in thinking that if they could bring the nations into the Christian organization, the intention of Christ would be carried out. History shews that though the visible Church has had a splendid career, and been in a sense the salvation of mankind, yet she has never been more than a faint adumbration of the true Kingdom of Heaven,

"that untravelled world, whose margin fades for ever and for ever, as we move."

A very different kind of interpretation is much more common in this country; and has in our days rapidly spread. We live in a materialist age. The rapid progress of science, the enormous increase of the comforts and conveniences of life, have indisposed most of us to look at the things which are unseen and eternal. The tendency of the time in Europe and America has been an earthward pilgrimage. So we cannot be surprised if, following the example of the more leisured classes, the mass of the proletariate have been dreaming of, and working for, a Kingdom which comes with observation, a commonwealth in which all shall have equal opportunities, and everyone live in comfort, when towns shall be carefully planned, work confined to a few hours a day, and the use of time so arranged that everyone may develop his faculties, and have the enjoyments which he covets.

That the existing social arrangements are very unsatisfactory, that there is a shocking contrast between the existing extremes of wealth and poverty, that reason combined with kindliness can do much to raise the average level of life, and to produce a cleaner, healthier, happier state of society, few would doubt. But it is another thing to say or to imagine that the outward and material good of the people is the one thing to be aimed at, even when the direct road leads through the violation of contract, the contempt of traditional morality, the abolition of order and discipline.

In the time of our Lord many of the Jews looked for a mere material kingdom; they wished to take Him by force and make Him a king; they thought that the first thing was to throw off Roman domination. How this tendency ended we all know, —in the sack of Jerusalem, and the almost complete extermination of the Jews in Palestine. And Jesus had foreseen all this.

> "Daughters of Jerusalem weep not for me, but weep for yourselves and for your children."

The alternative, which He set forth for it, did not indeed imply contempt for material good. It is clear from the Gospels that He regarded disease as kindred in nature to sin, and had the keenest sympathy with all natural and innocent enjoyment. But yet He constantly and remorselessly set forth the eternal principles, that happiness is different from mere gratification; that a man may lose his life by trying to save it; that the search for righteousness is more in accord with the divine will than the search for pleasure.

> "Your heavenly Father knoweth that ye have need of these things."
> "Seek ye first the Kingdom of God and His righteousness, and all these things shall be added unto you."

Thus without the pursuit of righteousness, without love for man as man, and desire to do the will of God, the search for a mere industrial and social Utopia will ever lead to nothing but failure. This has been illustrated a hundred times in the course even of recent history. "Your Fouriers failed," wrote Mrs. Browning, "because not poets enough to understand that life develops from within." The notion that happiness is like coals or bread, a thing of which a certain amount exists, and which has to be given out like rations, is a most grotesque blunder in psychology. Life and happiness, like the Kingdom of God, are within us, and well up from the spiritual principle within us, not of course without any relation to external conditions, but by no means entirely depending on them. If the Utopia of such writers as Mr. Bellamy in *Looking Backward* were realized, an Utopia out of relation to ethics and religion, the human race might perish of sheer *ennui* and satiety.

The law of the higher life remains ever dominant, that those who wish to make men happier must begin by making them better, that the Kingdom of God is not meat and drink, but righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Spirit.

A most instructive example to illustrate this truth is furnished by the history of an attempt recently made by some Australian socialists, to establish in Uruguay a community based only on the ideas of secular altruism. The story has been written by

Mr. Stewart Grahame. The community started with every advantage, enthusiasm, wealth, energy. Yet its history is deplorable, a record of little but quarrels and hatred. It went from bad to worse, until the members themselves called it a hell upon earth, and it was only saved from utter ruin by the coming of a schoolmaster, who brought in some Christian ideas, and gave a soul to the body.

> "So is he that layeth up treasure upon earth, and is not rich towards God."

At a later time in His life Jesus warned His disciples against those who cried Lo, here! or Lo, there! who in their impatience to welcome the Kingdom saw its approach in political crisis and social upheaval. The warning stands for all time. All of us are ready to believe that the particular *ism* to which we are attached, pacificism or socialism or democratic government, will produce a millennium. When the present terrible war broke upon us we were all for a time thrown off our balance, and many of us thought that a war against war, an uprising of the free peoples against military brutality, would lead us straight to an ideal commonwealth of nations, and to a world of general happiness. If we have not wholly given up that hope, we have at least learned to moderate it. We must be content to be patient. The Kingdom of God will not be brought in by violence, however well the use of force may be justified. It must come from the working together of God and man. Men, unhelped by the Divine Spirit, will never be able to bring it to the birth. And God will never by a sudden cataclysm bring it upon men. "The mills of God grind slowly." The heavenly city appears as a glorious vision on a high mountain top, and we can only hope to reach it after long journeyings. It is also, it is true, among us and within us; but we can only by long striving and much patience produce it in visible form in the world.

The really Christian teaching in regard to the Kingdom of God is that it is always, at least potentially, among men;

that beneath the universe of sensuous experience there lies a spiritual realm, related to the visible world as the soul is related to the body; that the spirit of God is always in contact with the spirits of those who try to do His will, and that by obedience and faith each man may rise into a world beyond sense, and become a citizen of the Kingdom of God. Spiritual philosophers in all ages since philosophy began have seen something of this inner and higher realm; but they have seldom risen into it. Some have tried to approach it by thought, some by mystical contemplation. Ascetics have tried to climb into it by quelling the flesh, and quenching all the natural appetites. It would ill become any of us to speak disparagingly of any honest attempt to struggle upwards into the higher plane. But for the Christian there is a ladder set up from earth to heaven, a ladder hard to mount, yet on the steps of which we see the forms of all who have been most notable in the faith. The author of the Fourth Gospel is the greatest exponent of this way. And the phrase in which he sums it up, *eternal life*, is a most significant expression. But it would savour of intolerable intellectual conceit if we supposed that only those who could understand philosophy could enter into the Kingdom. It is far less by thought than by self-control and pure affections that men realize the inevitable dominance of the spiritual world. The Fourth Evangelist says that spiritual Christianity appeals to the children of the light, who have the word of God abiding in them. Such, whether learned or unlearned, whether rich or poor, are the salt of the earth. The rest of us can but look up to them, and gropingly follow in their footsteps. And it is only so far as the spirit which such men exhibit to the world tinges measures of social reform or economic progress that such reform and progress can really prosper, because they become conformed to the will of God, and suited to the ultimate foundations of human nature.

Those who, in their quest of the Kingdom of God, came to John the Baptist, confessed their sins and submitted to baptism.

Those who came to Jesus, accepted Him as leader and master. To both teachers the door of the road which led to the Kingdom lay through repentance and righteousness. The idea of repentance may have been much the same in both societies. But the idea of righteousness was very different. John seems to have inculcated a reformed way of life; the tax-gatherers were exhorted to exact no more than was due; the soldiers to abstain from deeds of violence; all to be kindly and helpful one to another. It is scarcely necessary to say that the righteousness demanded by Jesus was of another and a far less superficial character. Love to God and man, a cleansed heart, a strong desire to live in accordance with the will of God, a childlike trust in the Father in Heaven, dependence on the Divine Spirit—this is the way of life which He set forth as leading to the Kingdom. And surely, just so far as this way of life has prevailed in the Church, it has come near to the ideal and spiritual realm. "The Kingdom of God," wrote St. Paul, "is righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Spirit. He that herein serveth Christ is well pleasing to God and approved of men." It is not, he says, eating and drinking; and it is not democratic government, or equality of the sexes, or asceticism in any form; but an attitude of spirit both in individuals and societies, which may indeed be helped by rites, by beliefs, by sacraments, by institutions; but which is to these external things what the spirit of man is to his body, and the Divine Spirit to order and beauty in the visible and material world. May God grant to each of us to find the gate of the Divine Kingdom.

REVIEWS.

A FRENCH PATRIOT'S RELIGION.*

"We live upon a shadow of a shadow: upon what will those who follow us base their life?" asked Renan of his generation. M. Loisy, upon whom the mantle of that kindly iconoclast may be said to have fallen, attempts an answer to the question. He too, like his spiritual father, has broken with the Church that reared him, yet he, unlike Renan, has none of that genial scepticism which smiles or sighs at *le spectacle bariole que present le genre humaine*: for Loisy is a believer, a propagandist, the exponent of a faith and a Religion. "Incredulity, as such, can never be a principle of earnest life" is his axiom.

Loisy is not one of those whose ignorance of human nature, and of history recommends to them a superficial solution of our moral and social problems. He sees that the roots of human conduct go deep. "Human morality is far from being simply equivalent to an instruction of the reason:" it is not an abstract science to be learned, but "an inner life which rules the external life, a moulding of the soul, intellect, sentiments, and will." Hitherto the Catholic tradition has provided the environment, the discipline, the motives that were necessary—but now? Can any "lay morality," any civic education, however rational and enlightened by modern scientific principles, succeed in substituting a new dynamic for the old? The problem is infinitely difficult. French secularists are an optimistic breed, but Loisy is not of their number. Clericals and anti-clericals speak after their kind, and both with an ill-considered and dogmatic confidence.

What can be a spiritual equivalent for the old religion? It has not yet been found. *Une opinion soi-disant savante qui voulait être une religion* will not do. Religion is more than a theory of the universe, and morality more than social mechanism. Both are instinctive and fundamental. New religions are not wanting, and new moralities are offered by every novelist, but these hucksters understand the nature of neither morality nor religion.

Loisy, following Kant, goes back to the categorical imperative. Duty is the *datum* without which "ye can do nothing." And Duty is the product of a mystic feeling of dependence upon society, "considered not materially but spiritually in the ideal which it preserves." Note the idealism here. Loisy is no disciple of Jeremy Bentham. *Calcul et devouement sont choses qui s'excluent;*" and the religious and moral elements, which are the cement of society, cannot be supplied by calculation. "A *régime* of interests and pleasures carefully balanced and combined," cannot be regarded as a satisfying ideal; it will never attract or retain the devotion of mankind.

The vexed question of "sex" is not avoided by Loisy. Ardent believers in some kind of a "neo-ethic" will find his views reactionary. He retains

* *La Religion*, par Alfred Loisy. Nourry, Paris, 3 fr. 50 (1917).

the belief, and supports it by argument, that those who eloquently plead for what is called "free love" act "not in favour of humanity, but of animality." The warning is not out of season; for what has been called *la nostalgie de la boue* has become endemic in some quarters. And the following pronouncement may seem puritanical, but it is probably sound:—

> "A strong moral discipline of the family will be more and more indispensable to the peoples that are anxious to survive." Without this, "all attempts at social amelioration will be superfluous."

M. Loisy's inspiration, however, is not a blind conservatism (he would not trouble to argue with the intransigents), but a hatred of that false individualism, which, under many specious disguises, masquerades everywhere, and has penetrated the mentality even of "progressive" circles. After all, the *raison d'être* of "sex" is not only the production of children, still less the satisfaction of emotional or physical appetites. "It is not everything that children be born, they have to be made into men," and no merely material interest will compensate the efforts demanded. "It is not to the interest of humanity to destroy, but to fulfil the present discipline," sums up Loisy's position on this much canvassed-topic.

His remarks upon social and political discipline are equally unsensational, and will seem equally "reactionary" in the eyes of our wilder prophets. We are reminded, not inopportunely, that political liberty has not seldom been "the faculty of employing oneself in the subversion of the state." And (a truth as profound as it is everywhere neglected by facile demagogues) "a democracy cannot subsist where there is not a high ideal of morality, and there can be no such high ideal which is not of an essentially religious character." "Man," we are reminded (and this applies to "sex" as well as to politics), "is not so far advanced from animality that the return thereto may not be at once easy and prompt."[1] "A society where riches and well-being are the only objects of pursuit—the maximum of well-being with the minimum of work—without any care of the human dignity of the individual, both in the family and in public life, would quickly become a Sodom or a Hell, or both." Even Socialism (that *panacea*), if it does not provide "a grand moral ideal," instead of bringing salvation to society will "precipitate an universal decadence."

And so we are brought back to this: a more and more perfect human discipline is the only guarantee of progress; and men can only become more happy by becoming better—"Such is the honourable law of our development." But what is to be the new inspiration, the new sanction, of morality? Loisy adumbrates this without defining it—

> "It does not enter into the purpose of the present book, and it would be premature, to trace the lines upon which the humanity that is in the making, will settle the expression of its faith."

At present, an Ideal Humanity, seems to Loisy a sufficient aspiration to inspire self-sacrifice and duty amongst us. This, and not "a metaphysical conception of the universe," will provide a basis for the new religion.

[1] cf. *Romain Rolland*, in *Jean Christophe*, who speaks of "the perpetual contrast between the extreme refinement of apparent civilisation and its fundamental animalism."

"In humanity we see the true Christ of Eternity, ever suffering, ever dying, ever rising again."

"In spite of all, we believe and desire to believe, far-off though the ideal may appear, in the advent of a Humanity which shall be one, holy, universal, perpetual, the veritable Church of the Spirit."

These are passages full of that eloquence which sincerity alone can inspire. We do not transcribe them to criticise them, they are the utterances of a great soul. And though around Loisy's head may gleam *l'auréole d'un hérésiarque*, his words will meet with the respectful attention of his countrymen—and of Europe at large.

J.C.H.

THE BANKRUPTCY OF RELIGION.*

Mr. Joseph McCabe, for years a Roman Catholic monk, and now an ardent secularist, is one whose honesty we honour, but with whom we find it impossible to agree. He has cast away everything Romanist except its intolerance, and now lives not simply to destroy superstition, but even religion itself. His latest book, *The Bankruptcy of Religion*, exhibits the hopeless position of traditional Christianity in the light of modern knowledge and modern thought, but it is very far from shewing that the Christian Religion itself is bankrupt, still less all religion. To shew that Science and *Genesis* are not in agreement; to shew that a number of statements in the Old and New Testaments are unhistorical; to shew that the Christian Church has oftentimes acted in an immoral and inhuman fashion, is not to demonstrate that the Religion of Christ is bankrupt. Auguste Sabatier asserts, what the study of Comparative Religion and the History of Religion seem to prove, that "mankind is incurably religious." If this be so, secularists are fighting a hopeless, though it may be a heroic, fight, for they are fighting against the constitution of human nature itself, and they stand no more chance of ultimate success than the irrationalists.

When Mr. McCabe is engaged in opposing irrationalism, and in demolishing superstition, we are altogether with him; when he is arguing that there is no need for belief in God, we feel he is not only wrong, but behind the times. To be a rationalist is not necessarily to be a secularist; in fact we should claim that to be a rationalist is to be a theist, and that the great majority of our thinkers are theists. It is not the miraculous birth and the physical resurrection, still less is it some propitiatory doctrine of atonement, which constitute the Religion of Christ. Of course Mr. McCabe and all our traditionalist friends are united in contradicting that assertion. Time, however, will prove them wrong, for the Religion of Christ is still very young, and has a long way to go, and we shall see more clearly what it really is as the journey proceeds. For the modern Christian (and he, if we are evolutionists, has the best right to be heard to-day) the Christian Religion consists primarily of three things. These are the knowledge of the Divine

* *The Bankruptcy of Religion*, by Joseph McCabe. Watts & Co., 5/- net.

Nature given to us in Jesus Christ; the ideals of conduct contained in His teaching; the Divine transforming spirit which becomes the possession of those who earnestly seek the Father through Him. This, of course, is an irritating view of the Christian Religion for those who rejoice in the conviction that when they are disproving the miracle of the Virgin Birth and the physical Resurrection and Ascension, they are overthrowing Christianity. In a way we are sorry to disappoint such honest, courageous, hard-headed fellows, but the fact is the Christian Church lives and learns in accordance with her Founder's promise that His disciples should enjoy the presence of the Spirit of Truth which should guide them into all truth. The Christian Religion is the Religion of the Spirit, a spirit of love, light, and truth. It is true that when we look back on the history of the Christian Church, we find much less evidence of the presence of that spirit than we should like to see. This fact, however, does not prove that Christ's promise was false, but that the vast majority of those who have borne His name have not been His true disciples. For example, Pope Pius IX. had infinitely less claim than Mazzini to be considered a disciple of Christ. However, the realisation of the true nature of the Religion of Christ is growing fast to-day, and it is certain that it is only as it does grow that the world will become better and happier. So far from the Religion of Christ being bankrupt as Mr. McCabe supposes, its moral and spiritual treasures have hardly as yet been drawn upon at all by the Church at large.

Anything like a detailed review of Mr. McCabe's book is impossible; it deals with too much. It seems to us to suffer somewhat from that rhetorical exaggeration which too often marks the style of the ecclesiastic even when he has discarded his cassock. The history of the Christian Church is neither so dark nor so feeble as he paints it; nor is it so benign or so beneficient as it appears in the pages of Christian apologists. Did space permit, we should like to discuss some of his historical verdicts, *e.g.*, that the birth narratives in Luke and Matthew are second century additions to the Gospels: or that "probably by the beginning of the fourth century there were not 100,000 Christians in the whole of Europe, apart from Greece, and not more than a million in the entire Empire." In that case it was the *In hoc signo* vision which converted Constantine, and not the influential number of the Christians.

H.D.A.M.

VISION AND SERVICE.*

A small book, under the title of *Vision and Service*, has recently been published. It consists of sermons, papers, and letters by the late Canon Barnett. Its chief usefulness will be realized by those, and they are many, who have learned from the Canon, whom they loved, that the secret motive of service is the vision of the Kingdom and of the King in His beauty. Everything that recalls Canon Barnett's spirit, and helps us to feel again

* *Vision and Service*, by Canon Barnett. Pub. Hazell, Watson, & Viney, Kirby Street, E.C. 1. Price 1/-.

the atmosphere in which he lived and worked, is of the utmost value to us to-day when we are faced by every social problem in its acutest form.

The sermons are models of what sermons should be. They are religious and they are short. The preacher put his soul into them, and through them, spirit speaks with spirit. The abstracts of papers and articles indicate, by the variety of their titles, the wide field in which the Canon's mind worked, and they will be most helpful to many a distressed preacher when he is agonizing with the question of next Sunday's subject. The papers are full of just that suggestive thought that is so often needed to set our own minds working. If we follow the lead here given we shall find that we are going upwards and onwards.

The Canon was, for years, a supporter of the Churchmen's Union. How thoroughly he was in sympathy with all that is best in our movement may be appreciated by reading the following short extracts. Speaking of Christianity, he says:—

"It is the realization in Jesus of the one holy God."

"It is the conception of Jesus as the God who is nigh to every heart."

"It is the divinization of human nature."

"This truth has been preserved in sacraments, in ecclesiastical organizations, and in codes of duties, but acceptance of doctrines and performance of duties do not constitute Christianity. The conception of Jesus is always growing larger, while these forms are fixed."

In one short pregnant sentence the Canon has summed up the objective of Modern Churchmen:—

"The new thought of God may be accepted and the historic ritual retained."

W.M.

CHURCHMEN'S UNION NEWS.

The Council met at the Church House, Westminster, on October 3rd. In accordance with a representation that members of the Union would like to have some information about the Council's proceedings published in the *Modern Churchman*, the Secretary has supplied the following notes:—

Membership.—50 new members were elected to the Union; 14 members having been lost through death or withdrawal. The net increase for the year is 100.

Vice-President.—The Dean of Peterborough was unanimously elected a Vice-President.

Church and State.—The Committee appointed to draw up a Memorandum reported that their draft was not quite ready, but would be presented at the next meeting.

Name of the Union.—Mr. Handley, seconded by Mr. Emmet, proposed that the long debated question of changing the name to "the *Modern* Churchmen's Union" be decided by a referendum. The Council agreed to this, and authorised the necessary arrangements.

The position of Women in the Church.—A resolution was received, which was passed by a meeting at Girton Conference. The consideration of it was deferred till January, when the Council will have before it the report of a committee upon the whole question.

Lay Section.—The following resolution, proposed by Mr. Gordon and seconded by Mr. Shaw Stewart, was carried unanimously:—

> "That the Council approves of the formation of a Lay Section of the Union, consisting of all the Lay Members of the Union who signify their willingness to join; and that the Lay Members of the Council and others whom they may co-opt, be a provisional Committee to consider and settle a scheme of procedure, and to make the necessary arrangements for carrying the same into effect."

After the Council Meeting, the lay members remained, as a provisional Committee, to make arrangements for the constitution of the Lay Section.

Yorkshire Branch.—A meeting was held on October 31st in the Church Institute, Harrogate, Mr. P. H. Bagenal in the chair. The Report of the Archbishops' Committee on Church and State was introduced by the Rev. H. D. A. Major. This led to an interesting discussion, at the close of which the meeting passed the following resolution:—

> "That this meeting approves in general terms of the proposals of the Archbishops' Report on Church and State, but does not desire to see it adopted without the following alterations—(*a*) That the Church franchise be extended to all who are baptised and declare themselves to be members of the Church of England. (*b*) That women be admitted as representatives to the Ruri-decanal Conferences and Diocesan Conferences. (*c*) That no canon of the Church Council be permitted to become law without first being submitted to the Parliamentary vote. (*d*) That a definition of the constitution, functions, and powers of Parochial Councils be included in the Enabling Act. (*e*) That careful provision be made, either by cumulative voting or some other means, for the representation of minorities at every stage in the elective process to the Church Council. (*f*) That the power of the Church Council to initiate legislation by canon be strictly defined and limited. (*g*) That the initiation of legislation dealing with doctrinal and liturgical matters be not limited to the House of Bishops."

Two recommendations were sent up by the meeting to the Secretary of the Union:—(1) That the Yorkshire Branch hopes that the Council will arrange to hold one meeting in 1918 at Leeds. (2) That the Council be urged to take up the question of the Archbishops' Report, and to initiate a campaign of criticism on constructive lines.

Bristol Branch.—The third Annual Service was held at St. Paul's Church, Clifton, on October 29th. The Rev. Canon Haigh (Vicar), and the Rev. J. Gamble officiated. The sermon was preached by the Rev. J. R. Wilkinson, Rector of Winford. The Service included special hymns and prayers, and an anthem by the choir. A most unfavourable evening accounted for the small congregation present.

Lecture by Canon Vernon Storr.—On Tuesday, November 6th, the local members welcomed Canon Storr, Hon. Canon of Winchester, and formerly Fellow of University College, Oxford. A most encouraging attendance of members and others filled the Concert Room of the West of England Academy. The Rev. J. Gamble presided, the subject of the lecture was "Some Aspects of the Problem of Immortality." Canon Storr gave a most interesting and clear exposition of his theme, and the discussion which followed showed that the lecturer had been closely followed by his audience. This was the first of a course of four lectures arranged for the winter session.

London Branch.—Two meetings of the West London Branch have been held. On October 2nd at 14, Warwick Avenue, by kind invitation of Mr. and Mrs. Demain Saunders, when a paper was read by the Rev. C. Moxon, on "The Place of Jesus in a Modernist's Faith."

On November 6th, by kind invitation of the Rev. W. E. and Mrs. Rosedale, a meeting was held at the Vicarage, St. Mary, Boltons, when the Rev. R. Webb-Odell read a paper on "Anglican Comprehensiveness."

C.U. Publications' Fund.—Donations since the publication of last list:—Rev. T. B. Green (Bristol), £1; Mr. F. N. Scott (Watford), £1; Mr. Champion Russell, 10/-; Miss Yapp (Ashton-under-Lyne), 10/-; a Member of Conference, 5/-. *Hon. Treasurer*, L. Reith, Summerfield, Ilkley.

THE LAY SECTION OF THE CHURCHMEN'S UNION.

By the Author of *Pro Christo et Ecclesia.*

The formation of a Lay Section in the Union is, I believe, an important step in the forward moment. If we analyse what is going on around us we shall see how this may be.

How many of the people we know have in the course of the last ten or twenty years given up going to Church. They do not read the Church papers, or take any further part in the organised religious life of the community. If we ask why this is we shall find the cause not simple but complex. The main part of it—often supposed to be the whole cause—is that educated people have ceased to accept the traditional interpretation of Christianity taught by the Church, and, supposing this to be the true interpretation, have given up regarding themselves as Christians. Behind this, however, there are other difficulties. Let us enquire what they are.

Mr. Goodlife is a lapsed layman in the case I have described. Personally he is not irreligious, being a reverent-minded man of sterling character. He is sure that the creeds, and his vicar's narrow views, and, possibly, the attitude of Convocation, are the cause of his neglect of organised religion. Yet, ask him if our cathedrals and parish churches mean nothing to him, and he says that he looks forward to a day when they will be available for a truly national religion. Ask him again what he hopes for the endowments of the Church, and you will find that he believes that some time they will be administered by wise men for the religious welfare of the nation. Finally, ask him what he thinks the religion of the future will be, and then, very unwillingly and haltingly, he will sketch out something which is quite consonant with the real truths of Christianity, and the best foundation for some of those great Christian truths of which he is at present experimentally ignorant but to which, when intelligently stated, he has nothing to oppose.

We all know Mr. Goodlife, or someone almost like him. Five years ago if we had told him that he was as responsible as anyone else for the religion of the future, and that he, who saw the need of Church reform, must, if he would live worthily, do his best to reform the Church, he would, if he answered frankly, have replied that he did not care enough to bestir himself. He will not give that answer to-day. I think it is not untrue to say that to-day nine out of every ten lapsed laymen are wistfully conscious that they want a reformed Church, and would be glad if they could do something, even at

the cost of time and trouble, to help on the reform. They are willing to say, "If I could help forward the reform it would be unworthy to neglect the opportunity."

We thus realise that, among the reasons why men and women neglect the Church, behind the questioning of certain doctrines lies a sense of powerlessness to help forward any improvement in the Church. As one earnest-minded man put it: "I must either quarrel with the vicar or let him alone, and even if I chose to quarrel with him, I could do nothing, single-handed as I am, to change things in the parish." Another objection that has been put forward is, "A man can't join in anything connected with the Church which is not managed by the clergy. We do not want to be managed by priests."

There are many earnest-minded men in all parts of the country who would now interest themselves in the Church if they could join some united effort for reform which was not "managed by the clergy." This lay section of the Churchmen's Union is an open door through which they can enter. If they come into the Union they will find that Christian faith can be intelligent, that Christian fellowship can strengthen and revive religious hope and aspiration, and by joining the lay section they may have a distinct voice in the movement for reform which is slowly gathering strength all over the land. Believing, as I do, that neglect of corporate religion has a benumbing and even deadening effect upon human life and character, I think we should all feel that the effort to bring lapsed laymen into touch with Church reform is a vital and very important way of rendering service to them, to the Church, and to God.

Let us all face bravely the great landslide that undoubtedly has taken place in the traditional views both of religion and morals, and realize that, after the war, we shall have a transitional period of terrible storm and stress, unless men and women of good will and religious aspiration can be organized to work in union for the corporate Christian life of the nation.

May I suggest that perhaps one good way of getting into connection with many educated men would be to send or lend them the *Modern Churchman?* In suggesting this I feel bound in honesty to say that I do not agree with the editor's view on the question of Church and State; nor do I believe, as he would appear to do, that it is possible for our populace to advocate reprisals without advocating revenge. I think, however, that this magazine is greatly to be valued. In every issue there is something which meets the ordinary difficulties of the sceptical man or woman of average education, and shows Christian theology to be a living power, nourished by progressive thought. To my certain knowledge there are many influential women estranged from the Church because they have never had a view of fundamental Church

doctrines set before them in a way that did not violate their sense of what is good and true in God's relation to His world. The strictly orthodox person who has never questioned these doctrines, does not understand how often the habitual presentment of them caricatures the truth he wishes to convey, and makes it appear that the God whom he worships is neither faithful nor kind to the greater part of His sentient creation.

A small fund has been started for sending specimen copies of the *Modern Churchman* to any of the lapsed laity at the request of those of our members who will merely state that they have personal knowledge that the gift would be opportune. May I ask lay members who sympathise with our project, to send, if they can, a few shillings to augment this fund?—for our members at large can often send a desirable address on a postcard when they cannot give time and trouble to remit sevenpence. When peace comes, and the majority of laymen have more leisure than at present, other means may be found to forward the work of this Lay Section. With this in view, will all those in sympathy return the green slips already received with the magazine, to the Honorary Secretary *(pro. tem.)*, Miss D. Nussey, Westfield, Ilkley, as soon as possible, that our organisers may know the support on which they may count.

CORRESPONDENCE.

REPRISALS AND CHRISTIAN ETHICS.

To the Editor of *The Modern Churchman.*

Sir,

In a great deal that is being written at the present time on the subject of reprisals for air-raids, the careful reader can scarcely avoid noticing that the word has come to be used in a variety of meanings. We hear it said that the adoption by this country of a policy of reprisals would be a moral degredation: and on the other hand, it is urged that "after all, war itself is a system of reprisals." A few days ago a friend remarked to me that if the Archbishop of Canterbury had spoken against reprisals he had acted foolishly; but a minute later the same speaker announced that he was opposed to our setting out deliberately to drop bombs upon German women and children. It appears to be necessary, therefore, for any writer or speaker on the subject to begin by stating as clearly as he can what he does, and what he does not mean by the term.

By reprisals, in this letter, no reference is intended to any development of the activity of our air forces in the direction of attacks upon German military centres, or upon industrial works (N.B.—works, not workers) which are engaged in the direct or indirect production of war material. An

increase of activity of this kind is, I think, a military matter, and raises no ethical questions but such as have been answered by implication already. Decision in regard to it would seem to be the business of the military authorities, and to depend on the question whether it can be undertaken without unduly weakening the vitally important work of our air-service along the battle front. Moreover, the fact that attacks of this kind would necessarily involve danger to life and limb of German civilians does not really complicate the issue. So long as the raid is directed to the destruction of military equipment,—so long, that is, as the harm done to civilians is an unavoidable incident, rather than the primary object of the attack, and so is kept within the smallest possible limits,—our consciences may be clear. Indeed, we shall probably feel that action of this kind would have been desirable even if there had been no German raids upon London and other towns at all. The injury done in such cases to non-combatants seems to fall in the same category as the incidental injury to civilians which is unavoidable in the bombardment of any fortified town.

There is, however, an altogether different sense in which the word is frequently used, and that is to describe attacks deliberately made upon open German town of no military importance, carried out with the avowed intention of injuring non-combatants. By an increasing number of people to-day such reprisals are defended as justifiable in order to put a stop to enemy raids on London. Their defence was attempted in your articles in the July *Modern Churchman*. It is with reprisals in this sense, and in this sense alone, that I am concerned in this letter.

It has often been said that we must distinguish between the two questions, "Would reprisals be effective in stopping hostile air-raids on England?" and "If effective, would they be right?" It is sometimes added that, while the latter question concerns the Christian moralist, the former must be left to military experts to answer. But, without disputing the necessity of distinguishing between the questions, it is perhaps permissible to express a doubt whether the former is, in point of fact, a military one. In so far as attacks by our air-men would keep the German air-service busy in defence, and so would diminish their power to attack us, it is obvious that a policy of systematic raids upon military and quasi-military centres would be at least as effective. Indeed, it follows, when we restrict the term "reprisals" to attacks deliberately made upon non-combatants, that their special effect upon the German war-lords would not be of the directly military kind, but would operate through their influence upon the minds of the civil population. And to say this is to say that the problem is a psychological one. We may be pardoned for feeling some hesitation as to whether the War Office is the most competent authority to deal with a matter of this sort; rather, it would seem that men who have spent their lives in studying the mental processes of the poor might be safer guides. We have to remember that the German civilians have been told, *and many of them believe*, that raids upon England have been directed exclusively against fortified places. Their leaders would therefore have little difficulty in persuading them that our reprisals were a barbarous innovation on our part in the horrors of war. And the result

might possibly be a determination, not to stop air-raids upon London, but to carry them out more ruthlessly than ever.

So much, perhaps, may be said in passing on the question of the effectiveness of reprisals; I turn to consider the second, and quite distinct, question whether, supposing they were effective, they would be justifiable. I shall try to show why I dissent altogether from the views expressed in your articles, "Reprisals" and "Sentimentalists and Casuists."

Let us try to imagine—and it needs but little effort—a room full of people discussing a recent air-raid, and let us consider what would probably be said. All would agree that the raid was an indefensible and utterly barbarous method of making war; all would agree that its barbarity consisted in this—that it was waged against non-combatants, and even against women and children; all would agree that the authorities who were responsible for it had put themselves outside the pale of civilisation; that they were no longer military foes, but criminals; that, in fact, no punishment could be too severe to inflict upon them. As we listened, we should think that we knew what was coming—what *must* come—next; surely it would be, "Let us put forth all our efforts to punish these wretches." But we were mistaken; and to our astonishment we hear, "Let us put forth all our efforts to punish those Germans who were not responsible for it at all." We almost doubt our ears in amazement at the extraordinary *nonse quitur*. We have been listening to an argument which appeared to lead irresistibly to its conclusion; and at the last moment there has come instead a conclusion by which the whole argumeut is stultified. We have laboured to prove the peculiar heinousness of the criminal, in order to justify us in punishing—somebody else! And before we have recovered from our bewilderment, it is suddenly increased by our recollecting that this kind of action—this operating upon the wrong people—is precisely the feature which constituted the enormity of the German crime.

The impression which I have tried to convey by this description is exactly the one which is made upon me by much that is written in defence of reprisals. It poses as an argument, and at the last moment it throws logic to the winds. We are told—what, surely, no-one denies—that love is compatible with justice, that punishment is lawful and necessary, that to give a man what he deserves is really to show him the truest kindness; *but all this is beside the point unless we are going to punish the right person.* As a justification of our punishing, with the utmost severity, those Germans who authorise and plan the raids, and perhaps also those who carry them out, it is unanswerable; but as a justification of our killing those who do not, it is simply irrelevant. It may be that reprisals can be justified; but they certainly cannot be justified by such logic as this.

You, Sir, appear to recognise this difficulty by your reference (on page 212) to "the strongest moral argument against reprisals." You tell us that it is in accordance with the working of divine law in human affairs that the punishment should fall partly upon the wrong people. The results of a man's crime are never confined to himself. The sins of the fathers are visited upon the children. This is unquestionably a most important truth;

and so far am I from denying it, that, a few years ago, I suggested elsewhere that it was in its insistence upon this aspect of social solidarity that the permanent value of the Second Commandment was to be found. But, if the truth is unquestionable, it is equally unquestionable that there are forms of vicarious punishment to which this defence will not apply. The children of a drunkard suffer innumerable hardships and handicaps in consequence of their father's sin; but, while we admit it, we do not make it the basis of an argument for imprisoning the child on account of the disorderly conduct of the father. Or, again, if a murderer is hanged, unimaginable anguish may be caused in the heart of some woman who loved him; but it would be a curious proceeding to appeal to this instance of the divine law of human solidarity to justify the hanging of the man's aged mother as well as, or instead of, himself.

On page 213 there occurs a more astounding attempt to deal with the difficulty. "The question," you say, is this:—"If the innocent cannot be separated from the guilty, ought the guilty therefore to be spared and allowed to continue unpunished their evil ways? It is not for the good of humanity that the guilty should be spared even though the innocent should suffer with them." Such a view is contrary to both the theory and the practice of the present day. Let me make clear what it means by an illustration. Suppose that a man has been found murdered in his house, and it is known that two men, and two men only, have had the opportunity of seeing him there. It is quite certain that one of the two is the murderer; and it is impossible to discover which. I must suppose that you would say, "Hang both. It is true that thus an innocent man will be executed, but only so can we make sure that the guilty man shall be punished." But modern civilization decides differently: "Spare both. It is true that thus a guilty man will go free, but only so can we make sure that the innocent man shall not die unjustly." Most of us think that the punishment of wrong-doing, important as it is, is yet not the most important thing in life.

It is common to hear it said that we cannot discriminate between the different members of the German nation. This is a war of peoples, and we must hold the whole nation responsible for what is done by its armies. The German people is behind the army in this struggle, supporting it, backing it up, identified with it. Now it might be asked in reply whether it is not pressing the popular notion of democracy somewhat far to hold that even babies and young children in Germany are responsible for the acts of their rulers. Perhaps Samuel was under the influence of similar notions about child-responsibility when he commanded Saul to spare neither infant nor suckling among the Amalekites. But, not to press this objection (which in any case, would not apply to your article, see page 212), it may still be questioned whether we do wisely when, in our eagerness to justify reprisals are we light-heartedly dispose of the ground on which our abhorrence of German air-raids has grown and flourished. For "a war of peoples" is a double-edged phrase. Used in this connexion, and for this purpose, it means that the distinction between combatants and non-combatants no longer exists for practical purposes. And if this is really our view, we are not entitled

to feel any indignation when the raiding aeroplanes drop their bombs on London.

Finally, the case is not improved if we put aside all talk about punishment, and try to justify reprisals by the plea that they are necessary as a deterrent. Of course we can assert, as you, Sir, tell us on page 210, that if we carry them out, our motive is at least a humanitarian one. We are killing unoffending Germans in order to save the lives of unoffending English people; and, if our raids are effective, then in the long run we are diminishing, and not increasing, the sum of human suffering. After all, the maxim that the end justifies the means has a good deal to say for itself. Undoubtedly it has; but, once more, we are using a double-edged weapon. For it is, of course, the precise argument by which the Germans justify their raids, that they will shorten the war, and so, in the long run, will diminish the suffering which it causes. Once admit that the end justifies the means in such matters, and it is easy to make an excellent defence of the German policy. An argument which proves too much is not one to be lightly adopted.

May I sum up the main points of this letter? In opposition to the view expressed in "Sentimentalists and Casuists" I have tried to show (1) that the humanitarian argument for reprisals proves too much; (2) that the application of the idea of punishment breaks down at the crucial point; (3) that your reply to "the strongest moral argument against" them is unsatisfactory. I must apologise for taking up so much of your space in doing so, but perhaps the importance of the subject justifies it.

The war has, all along, been seen to involve much more than a material struggle. It is, we all feel, a conflict of ideals, a conflict of views about human conduct. The defeat of the German armies is assured; but the defeat of German ideas about right and wrong is a harder task to compass. Yet it is that that matters most—matters, indeed, infinitely more than the other. And there are some who think that the adoption by this country of a reprisal policy, in the sense in which the word has been used in this letter, would be an element in a German victory on this most vital plane.

Harrow-on-the-Hill. C. F. RUSSELL.

[In the articles to which our correspondent refers, we maintained that as the Germans by bombing English unfortified towns, and killing the civilian population, had practically refused to recognise the humane distinction between combatants and non-combatants, the English authorities would be morally justified for the purpose of protecting our non-combatants in doing the same. Our correspondent appears not only to agree to this (although he takes exception to some of the arguments which we used in urging it) but to go much further than we were disposed to go, when he asserts that it would have been morally justifiable for the British to bomb German industrial works before the Germans had done so in our case. Such action seems to us to be both inhuman and (in the light of pre-war international agreements) treacherous and exactly of that character which we regard as morally indefensible in the case of Germany.

To suppose, as our correspondent does, that it would be practicable to bomb industrial works without bombing the workers seems to us to exhibit a benevolent but ill-founded optimism. We have no space to deal with many of our correspondent's arguments, although we question the cogency of some of them. We are glad, however, that our readers should have the opportunity of weighing them, and in deciding, if it seem worth while, whether our correspondent or we have been most successful iu combating German immoral ideals.—Ed. *M.C.*]

REPRISALS.

To the Editor of The Modern Churchman.

Sir,

Surely you ignore some points of importance:—

(1) The best defence of "reprisals" is that all war is reprisal; that acts of warfare differ only in degree; that war once declared, moral principle has nothing to say as to the means to be taken for destroying the enemy; and, particularly, that in modern warfare there is no longer any distinction between combatants and non-combatants, between the soldiery and the civil population. There was an effective article on these lines recently, by G. B. Shaw, in the *Nation*. In short, to object to reprisals is to object to war. The real question is whether war can ever be regarded as a Christian institution. Personally, I think not, although warriors can be Christians.

(2) The recent demand, in the press and elsewhere, for "reprisals" was essentially a demand for vengeance.

(3) You take it for granted that the Allies, as belligerents, can not only think of themselves as ministers of justice, but can expect the enemy to adopt this view as well. At least, I don't see otherwise what point there is in all you say about punishment and "suffering inflicted in no spirit of revenge, but as a means of moral discipline and education." (p. 155).

(4) Surely it is profoundly true that for the Christian "the world is not the world as it is." It is the world of "things as they are" that is unreal. Let us "face facts" by all means, but what distinguishes us from other people is that we have seen a vision, and believe that the "dream" can come true.

St. George's Rectory,
Bloomsbury, W.C.

W. C. Roberts.

[(1) Whilst as anxious as our correspondent to see all war abolished, we feel, meanwhile, that rules which humanize it as far as possible should be made and enforced. When these rules are broken, we believe that reprisals are permissible if, by the making of reprisals, the recurrence of such atrocities can probably be prevented.

We cannot possibly agree with our correspondent's view that there is no longer any distinction between combatants and non-combatants, and would point out that the treachery of Germany lies in her

recognizing the distinction at the Hague before the war began, but in her refusing to recognise it in practice on many occasions since.

(2) We condemn absolutely the demand for vengeance, but maintain that reprisals may be undertaken on the ground of (1) protection of non-combatants, (2) punishment for acts of treacherous inhumanity.

(3) The *rôle* of our Allies may differ from ours. We regard the British Empire in this conflict as a minister of divine justice, a champion of the rights of small nations against a brutal and unscrupulous militarism, and the defenders of British freedom, civilisation, and property. The Germans do not recognise us as ministers of justice now, yet the sufferings we may be the means of inflicting on them may yet contribute to their moral discipline and education. Criminals may fail at the time of their sentence and punishment to recognise their judge as the Divine minister of justice, and may yet do so at a later stage.

(4) We agree entirely with our correspondent's last paragraph, and regret having given a wrong impression.—Ed. *M.C.*]

THREE SERVICES REVISED.

Sir, *To the Editor of* The Modern Churchman.

I am sure that many Churchmen of all schools of thought will feel obliged to you for your article, "Three Services Revised," in the June number.

You have placed you finger upon one of the most pressing needs of the day, and the conviction that it is in these services that revision is imperatively needed, is not the conviction of one school of thought alone, but of great numbers of thoughtful and moderate Churchmen, who would gladly co-operate in any wise effort made along such a line.

Might I suggest that the revisions you have suggested be not allowed to remain, perhaps forgotten, in the June number? Could they not form the basis of a discussion at some future conference, and, meanwhile, might they not be published, either as they stand or after further revision, by the committee of the Manuals' Fund? I cannot think of any better use to which the Manuals' Fund could be put. I have long been personally persuaded that it is in these three services that revision should begin, and that until some such revision does come, no other revision will prove satisfactory.

Trinity College,
Foochow, China.

W. S. Pakenham-Walsh.

[The reviser has had several hundred copies of the services, with emendations and additions, printed off at his own expense. They can be obtained post free from Wm. Parr, Knaresborough. Price: single copies, 6d.; 3 copies, 1/-; 12 copies, 2/6.—Ed. *M.C.*]